



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/391,772	09/08/1999	WALTER V. DIXON III	RD-27.422	9058

7590 01/28/2003

JOHN S BEULICK  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE SUITE 2600  
ST LOUIS, MO 631022740

EXAMINER

COLBERT, ELLA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3624

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/391,772

Applicant(s)

DIXON ET AL.

Examiner

Ella Colbert

Art Unit

3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 November 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 November 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 04 November 2002 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

Art Unit: 3624

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 2, 5-9 and newly added claims 10-18 are pending. Claims 1, 5, 6, and 8 have been amended, claims 3 and 4 have been cancelled, and claims 10-18 have been added in this communication filed 11/04/02 entered as Amendment A and Extension of Time paper no. 7.

2. The Drawing Correction filed on 11/04/02 has been entered as paper no. 8.

3. The Formal Drawings filed on 11/04/02 has been reviewed and entered as paper no. 9.

4. The Drawing Objection for illegible labeling is hereby withdrawn in view of the Applicants' submission of formal drawings.

5. The Amendment to the Specification has been reviewed and approved.

#### Objection To Title Of The Invention

6. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: "A Method And Apparatus For Submitting A Report From An Accounting System To A Server."

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1, 2, and 6-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants' Specification and Title of the

Art Unit: 3624

Invention are directed to "An Automated Lending System". The Applicants' claim limitations claim submitting a report from an accounting system to a server.

Amended Claims 1, 6, 8, and 11 recite "a report having a defined format." It is not clear what Applicants' mean by "a defined format." Do Applicants' mean accounting format, report format, or print format?

Amended claims 12 and 14 recite "to normalize information." What do Applicants' mean by "to normalize information?" The Examiner cannot find the limitation "to normalize information" in Applicants' Specification. "To normalize" by definition means "to reduce to a standard or normal state or form."

Clarification in the claim language is requested.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1, 2, 8, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 5,864,871) Kitain et al, hereafter Kitain in view of (US 6,115,690) Wong.

With respect to claim 1, Kitain teaches, a method for submitting a report from an accounting system to a server, a local file system coupled to the accounting system (col. 2, lines 4-14, col. 7, lines 4-13, col. 9, lines 26-34, col. 11, lines 45-59, col. 13, lines 15-22, col. 14, lines 3-13, and col. 47, lines 64-67, & fig. 8), method comprising:

Art Unit: 3624

exporting the report and a local file system (col. 6, lines 62-67 and col. 7, lines 1-19); submitting the report from the local file system to the server using the browser (col. 11, lines 54, col. 13, lines 15-22, col. 14, lines 3-13, col. 47, lines 64-67, & fig. 8).

Kitain did not teach, generating at the accounting system a report having a defined format; determining at the server the defined format of the report; and extracting via the server information from the report based on the defined format to generate at least one exhibit to the report, the at least one exhibit summarizing specific information included in the report.

Wong discloses, generating at the accounting system a report having a defined format; determining at the server the defined format of the report (col. 4, lines 53-65 and col. 5, lines 1-8); determining at the server the defined format of the report (col. 5, lines 54-67 and col. 6, lines 1-6); and extracting via the server information from the report based on the defined format to generate at least one exhibit to the report, the at least one exhibit summarizing specific information included in the report (Figs. 95A-109B). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate at the accounting system a report having a defined format; determine at the server the defined format of the report; and extract via the server information from the report based on the defined format to generate at least one exhibit to the report, the at least one exhibit summarizing specific information included in the report and to modify in Kitain in view of Kitain's teachings of reports being sent to a repository server in col. 11, lines 47-54 and Wong's disclosure of an accounting system report and a server because such a modification would allow Kitain to have a process

Art Unit: 3624

that provides services to another process which is the server and on the Internet the server is attached to the Internet and contains HTML files (web pages) that are viewed through the browser (generating an exhibit to the report and summarizing specific information in the report).

Kitain did not teach, an accounting system, however an accounting system by definition is the methods, procedures, & standards followed in accumulating, classifying, recording, & reporting business events & transactions. The accounting system includes the formal records & original source data. Regulatory requirements may exist on how a particular accounting system is to be maintained (e.g. insurance company).

With respect to claim 2, Kitain teaches, submitting the report comprises attaching the report to a web form (col. 8, lines 15-27 and col. 10, lines 27-45).

With respect to claim 8, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

With respect to claim 10, Kitain teaches, wherein the local file system is accessible by a browser, and wherein submitting the report from the local file system to the server further comprises submitting the report from the local file system to the server using the browser (col. 1, lines 61-67, col. 2, lines 1-14, col. 11, lines 43-54, col. 13, lines 18-37, col. 15, lines 59-67, col. 16, lines 1-8, and col. 33, lines 49-55).

With respect to claim 11, Kitain did not teach, wherein generating at the accounting system a report having a defined format further comprises generating at the accounting system a report having a defined format wherein the defined format relates to a specific accounting system.

Art Unit: 3624

Wong teaches, wherein generating at the accounting system a report having a defined format further comprises generating at the accounting system a report having a defined format wherein the defined format relates to a specific accounting system (col. 4, lines 53-65 and col. 5, lines 1-8). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate at the accounting system a report having defined format further comprises generating at the accounting system a report having a defined format wherein the defined format relates to a specific accounting system and to modify in Kitain because such a modification would allow Kitain to have real-time, audit-ready financial information accurate up to the day or up to the hour available within minutes at the touch of a button without the need for a highly-trained accountant.

With respect to claim 12, Kitain and Wong did not teach, further comprising the step of utilizing a translation service at the server to normalize information included within the report such that the information included in the report is recognizable by the server, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a translation service at the server to normalize information included within the report such that the information included in the report is recognizable by the server and to modify in Kitain and Wong because such a modification would allow Kitain and Wong to provide information and links to other documents (reports) via the Internet and to another server.

Art Unit: 3624

11. Claims 5, 9, and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 5,864,871) Kitain et al, hereafter Kitain in view of (US 6,115,690) Wong and further in view of (US6,369,907) Aoki.

With respect to claim 5, Kitain teaches, extracting information from the report using a print scraping process (col. 5, lines 28-36).

With respect to claim 8, Kitain teaches, a local file system (col. 11, lines 43-54) and a server (col. 12, lines 62-67) for communicating with said local file system, said accounting system configured to generate a report having a defined format and export the report to said local file system, said server configured to determine said defined format and extract information from the report based on said defined format to generate at least one exhibit relating to the report wherein the exhibit summarizes specific information included in the report (col. 3, lines 55-67 and col. 32, lines 1-20).

This independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

With respect to claim 9, Kitain teaches, the local file system is accessible by a browser (col. 33, lines 49-55).

With respect to claim 13, Kitain and Wong did not teach, wherein extracting information from the report using a print scraping process further comprises; determining whether preprocessing of the report is needed; performing a document recognition process including scanning the report to determine a file type of the report and comparing the file type to a list of known file types stored in a data repository;



Art Unit: 3624

and performing a mapping and translation process on the report including selecting an extraction script based on the document recognition process for extracting and translating data from the report.

Aoki discloses, wherein extracting information from the report using a print scraping process further comprises; determining whether preprocessing of the report is needed (col.6, lines 43-61); performing a document recognition process including scanning the report to determine a file type of the report and comparing the file type to a list of known file types stored in a data repository (col. 2, lines 47-65 and col. 4, lines 5-26); and performing a mapping and translation process on the report including selecting an extraction script based on the document recognition process for extracting and translating data from the report (col. 5, lines 13-20 and col. 6, lines 19-31). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determining whether preprocessing of the report is needed; performing a document recognition process including scanning the report to determine a file type of the report and comparing the file type to a list of known file types stored in a data repository; and performing a mapping and translation process on the report including selecting an extraction script based on the document recognition process for extracting and translating data from the report and to modify in Kitain and Wong because such a modification would allow Kitain and Wong to have a system that captures and translates data between various computer platforms which is well known in the art of translating documents from one format to another format.

Art Unit: 3624

Kitain, Wong, and Aoki did not teach, determining whether segmentation of the report is needed, segmentation includes identifying a location of data within the report and relocating data within the report such that the document is recognizable, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine whether segmentation of the report is needed, segmentation includes identifying a location of data within the report and relocating data within the report such that the document is recognizable and to modify in Kitain, Wong, and Aoki because such a modification would allow Kitain, Wong, and Aoki to break down the report into individual segments, listed by segments' coverage, percentage coverage, estimate, frequency estimate, and other entries that may be of interest.

With respect to claim 14, Kitain, Wong, and Aoki did not teach, utilizing at the server, if needed, a translation service to normalize information included in the report such that the information included in the report is recognizable by the server, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize at the server, if needed, a translation service to normalize information included in the report such that the information included in the report is recognizable by the server and to modify in Kitain, Wong, and Aoki because such a modification would allow Kitain, Wong, and Aoki to provide information and links to other documents (reports) via the Internet and to another server.

This claim is also rejected for the similar rationale given above to claim 12.

With respect to claim 15, this claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claim 13.

Art Unit: 3624

With respect to claim 16, this claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claims 12 and 14.

With respect to claim 17, Kitain did not teach, a system comprising an accounting system including a virtual printer, and a server for communicating with said accounting system, said accounting system configured to generate a report having a specified format and transmit the report to said server via said virtual printer, said server configured to extract information from the report based on said specified format to generate at least one exhibit relating to the report wherein the exhibit summarizes specific data included in the report.

Wong discloses, a system comprising an accounting system (col. 4, lines 53-65 and col. 5, lines 1-8) and a server for communicating with said accounting system (col. 5, lines 54-67 and col. 6, lines 1-6) said accounting system configured to generate a report having a specified format and transmit the report to said server (col. 4, lines 53-65 and col. 5, lines 1-8), said server configured to extract information from the report based on said specified format to generate at least one exhibit relating to the report wherein the exhibit summarizes specific data included in the report (Figs. 95A-109B).

Kitain and Wong did not disclose, a virtual printer. Aoki discloses a virtual printer (col. 6, lines 52-58). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a system comprising an accounting system including a virtual printer, and a server for communicating with said accounting system, said accounting system configured to generate a report having a specified format and transmit the report to said server via said virtual printer, said server configured to extract

Art Unit: 3624

information from the report based on said specified format to generate at least one exhibit relating to the report wherein the exhibit summarizes specific data included in the report and to modify in Kitain because such a modification would allow Kitain to have a system with a process that provides services to another process which is a server and to provide information and links to other documents (reports) via the Internet and to another server.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a virtual printer and to modify in Kitain and Wong's systems because such a modification would allow Kitain and Wong to have a printer connected to the network and to display virtual printer information promptly to the computer.

With respect to claim 18, this claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claims 13 and 15.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 6,115,690) Wong in view of (US 6,369,907) Aoki.

With respect to claim 6, Wong teaches, generating at the accounting system a report having a specified format (col. 4, lines 53-65 and col. 5, lines 1-8); and extracting via the server information from the report based on the specified format to generate at

Art Unit: 3624

least one exhibit to the report, the at least one exhibit summarizing specific information included in the report (Figs. 95A-109B).

Aoki discloses, transmitting the report from the accounting system to the server via the virtual printer (col. 1, lines 60-67 and col. 2, lines 1-14).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transmitting the report from the accounting system to the server via the virtual printer and to modify in Wong because such a modification would allow Wong to have an information determination unit which determines whether another or at least one other device is available to support a functional upgrade of the printer itself based upon the ability information which was transmitted from other devices connected to the network in response to the inquiry for the ability information, and determines its printer's own virtual printer information.

With respect to claim 7, Wong did not teach, print scraping information from the report. Aoki discloses, print scraping information from the report (col. 1, lines 60-67 and col. 2, lines 1-65). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to print scrape information from the report and to modify in Wong because such a modification would allow Wong to have a system that can receive print commands of a computer and at least one other device to extract print from a report prior to printing.

### ***Response to Arguments***

14. Applicant's arguments filed 11/04/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 3624

Kitain neither describes nor suggests a method for submitting a report from an accounting system to a server that includes generating at the accounting system a report having a defined format, determining at the server the defined format of the report, and extracting via the server information from the report based on the defined format to generate at least one exhibit to the report wherein the exhibit summarizes specific information included in the report and there is no evidence that, in light of the cited art, one of ordinary skill in the art would be taught or motivated to submit a report from an accounting system to a server as recited in the present invention has been considered but is not persuasive for the following reasons: (1) Kitain teaches submitting a report, a file system, and a server in col. 2, lines 4-14, col. 7, lines 4-13, col. 9, lines 26-34, col. 11, lines 45-59, col. 13, lines 15-22, col. 14, lines 3-13 and col. 47, lines 64-67, and fig. 8. Kitain did not teach an accounting system, however, by definition "an accounting system is the methods, procedures, and standards followed in accumulating, classifying, recording, and reporting business events, and transactions. The accounting system includes formal records"; (2) Applicants' appear to be arguing their claim amendments; (3) claim 1 recites (unamended) "exporting the report from the accounting system to a local file system; and submitting the report from the local file system to the to the server using the browser"; and (4) Applicants arguments regarding the recitation submitting a report from an accounting system to a server, a local file system being coupled to the accounting system and accessible by a browser" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the

Art Unit: 3624

purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). Therefore, Applicants' arguments of the claim amendments are considered "moot."

2. Applicants' argue: Kitain does not describe a system that includes an accounting system that is configured to generate a report having a defined format and export the report to a local file system, and a server that is configured to generate a report having a defined format and export the report to a local file system, and a server that is configured to determine the defined format and extract information from the report based one the defined exhibit relating to the report" has been considered but is not persuasive because Applicants' are arguing their amendment to claim 8 (see argument 1, *supra*). Therefore, this argument is considered "moot."

3. Applicants' argue: the mere assertion that such an apparatus would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art does not support a *prima facie* obvious rejection has been considered but is not persuasive based on the motivation need not be expressed in a reference used to show obviousness. It is assumed that which is not taught in the reference relies to some extent on the knowledge of persons skilled in the art to complement that which is known and the skilled artisan is presumed to know something more about the art than only what is disclosed in the applied reference.

Sources of Rationale Supporting a Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103: Rationale may be in a reference, or reasoned from common knowledge in the art, scientific principles, art-recognized equivalents, or legal precedent. See MPEP 2144.

4. Applicants' argue: Kitain does not describe or suggest a method for submitting a report from an accounting system to a server, wherein the accounting system includes generating at the accounting system to the server via the virtual printer, and extracting via the server information from the report based on the specified format to generate at least one exhibit to the report wherein the least one exhibit summarizes specific information included in the report" has been considered but is not persuasive because (1) a preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). Applicants' appear to be arguing the amendments to claim 6. Therefore, Applicants' arguments of the claim amendments are considered "moot." See argument no. 1, *supra*.

5. Applicants' argue: obviousness cannot be established by merely suggesting that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Kitain using the teachings of Aoki and as is well established obviousness cannot be established by combining teachings of the cited art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive supporting the combination.



Art Unit: 3624

Specifically, one cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention and it is impermissible to pick and choose from one reference only so much of it as will support a given position, to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art. These arguments have been considered but are not persuasive based on it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In conclusion: Applicants' appear to be treating the references as though they were used in a 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection. A 35 U.S.C.103(a) rejection is a combination of one or more references with teachings and disclosures combined to produce the invention or what is known in the art of one having ordinary skill in the art or a "field of use".

The Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the Specification (see below):

2111 Claim Interpretation; Broadest Reasonable Interpretation [R-1]

>CLAIMS MUST BE GIVEN THEIR BROADEST REASONABLE INTERPRETATION

*During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the*

Art Unit: 3624

*examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPO 541,550-51 (CCA 1969)<*

Claims should particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants' regard as the invention.

The Specification should be in agreement with what Applicants' are claiming as their invention. In particular, Applicants' are advised to see the 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph rejection.

### **Conclusion**

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is request to review the prior art of record prior to responding to this communication.

Apte et al (US 5,970,464) disclosed segmentation of a report.

Ogawa et al (US 5,608,874) disclosed data file format translation and transmission.

Erwin et al (US 6,24,770) disclosed a method and system for analyzing historical financial statements.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 3624


mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Inquiries***

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is 703-308-7064. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 am -5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 703-308-1038. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for Official communications and 703-746-5622 for Unofficial communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

  
E. Colbert  
January 21, 2003

  
VINCENT MILLIN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600